

### ***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-24 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 22, and 24 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 21, 23, and 24 have been amended to clearly recite features of the present invention. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

### ***Objections to the Claims***

Claim 23 was objected to for an improper dependency. Claim 23 has been amended to correct its dependency.

Claim 21 was objected to for allegedly containing Markush language. Claim 21 has been amended to clarify that the gaming terminals can include at least one of the listed types of terminals. The terminals can include one or more of the listed types. This is not Markush claiming. There is nothing ambiguous or indefinite about this claim.

### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 17-18, 21-22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,110,043). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner argues that Olsen teaches, *inter alia*:

apparatus including: a **primary** controller for determining the award of a prize (col 1, ln 63); and an **auxiliary** controller capable of communication with the

primary controller, the auxiliary controller being further capable of communication with one or more gaming terminals (col 13, ln 6-8). . . .

Office Action, p. 4. [Emphasis added.]

Olsen teaches only one controller 200. Nowhere does Olsen teach or suggest the use of a primary controller *and* an auxiliary controller in his system. Since Olsen teaches the use of only a single controller, Olsen cannot teach the following steps recited in claim 1:

communicating the total contributory amount from the *auxiliary* controller to the *primary* controller; or

if a prize is determined to be awarded, communicating data associated with the determination from the *primary* controller to the *auxiliary* controller.

Referring in particular to claim 9, the Examiner argues:

Olsen discloses: wherein the apparatus includes a plurality of auxiliary controllers each capable of communication with the primary controller and each capable of communication with a respective set of one or more gaming machines (col 13, ln 6-8).

Office Action, p. 5.

On the contrary, the portion of Olsen to which the Examiner refers states:

The CPU 372 can communicate over lines 366 and through buffer 368 with controller 200.

As noted above, Olsen teaches only one controller 200. There is no mention of a second controller in the portion of Olsen to which the Examiner refers or anywhere else in the Olsen disclosure.

Referring in particular to claim 11, the Examiner argues:

Olsen discloses: the step of communication from the auxiliary controller to the primary controller of an auxiliary controller identifier (col 13, ln 6-8).

Office Action, p. 5.

Inasmuch as the Examiner has cited the same portion of Olsen as used to reject claim 9, the same argument applies here as applies to claim 9.

Referring in particular to claim 18, the Examiner argues:

Olsen discloses: the step of communicating a win message from the auxiliary controller to the primary controller (col 9, ln 58-60).

Office Action, p. 5.

The portion of Olsen to which the Examiner refers states (the entire paragraph is set forth for context):

Within each gaming machine G are conventional signals indicating start of play S in the gaming machine and a play over signal O when the game being played in a machine is over (and whether the player has won or lost the game). These signals are conventionally delivered over a network 202b to the controller 200 of the present invention.

Once again, Olsen refers only to controller 200. There is no mention, teaching, or suggestion of a second, auxiliary, controller.

Independent claims 22 and 24 each recite the use of primary and auxiliary controllers.

Therefore Olsen cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the features of these claims.

Claims 2-6, 11, 17-18, and 21 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. These claims are not anticipated by Olsen for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated by Olsen, in addition to their own distinguishing features.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

A) Claims 12-16 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,110,043). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 12-16 and 19-20 depend from claim 1. There is no teaching or suggestion in Olsen to use more than a single controller in his system. There would have been no reason to

use more than a single controller in the type of system disclosed by Olsen. Thus the features recited in claims 12-16 and 19-20 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

B) Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Karmarkar (U.S. Patent No. 6,508,709). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1. As noted above, Olsen does not teach or suggest multiple controllers (i.e., primary and auxiliary controllers). Karmaker adds nothing to the teaching of Olsen to overcome the deficiencies of Olsen relative to the features recited in the combination of claims 1 and 7.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.

C) Claims 8, 10 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Giobbi (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0045354). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8 and 10 depend from claim 1. Claim 23 depends from claim 22. As noted above, Olsen does not teach or suggest multiple controllers (i.e., primary and auxiliary controllers). Giobbi adds nothing to the teaching of Olsen to overcome the deficiencies of Olsen relative to the features recited in the combination of claims 1 and 8 or 10, or claims 22-23.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection is respectfully requested.


### ***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward J. Kessler  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 25,688

Date: September 15, 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600  
822106.v1